

REMARKS

The rejection of Claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 has been addressed, to the extent necessary, by the foregoing amendments to the claims.

Applicants have now amended the claims to accord with language found at page 8, lines 14-24 of the Specification to explicate the structure shown in Figs. 1-3, particularly Fig. 3. Applicants believe, however, that the Examiner intended to refer to Claims 11 and 12 in paragraph 3 of the Office Action and not Claims 10 and 12.

The rejection of Claims 1-14 as being unpatentable over Kato et al., in view of Habert et al., under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants have previously explained why the method disclosed in the Kato et al., publication is patentably distinct from that of the present invention. The Office Action also candidly acknowledges yet another distinction with regard to the claimed tapered surface.

Applicants need, however, to repeat that their claimed invention deals with solving the noise and vibration problem encountered with prior art rotor-

cores including rotor-cores produced by the Kato et al., method. They also pointed out in the Specification that tapered surface production by, on one hand, milling, resulted in unacceptably larger processing time and higher cost due to subsequent required finishing, and, on the other hand, forging, created uneven material flow necessitating higher loads to achieve the needed accuracy and resulting in a shorter die life. Thus, the application of a radially directed forming pressure was something Applicants found to solve these problems directed to noise, vibration, surplus flash and material flow.

Thus, Applicants cannot agree that the Kato et al., publication discloses “substantially” the same invention as that claimed in the application. It suggests no such application of a forming pressure radially towards the blank axis to form the specified tapered surface on only one side of the claws as viewed in the circumferential direction. Regardless of the structure shown in Figs. 4-8 of the Habert patent, not the slightest hint is provided as to how the reliefs 9 are formed. And the present claims are directed to the method of manufacturing the rotor core, not the rotor core itself. Assuming, therefore, that it would have been obvious to combine the Kato et al., and Habert teachings, still no hint would be given as to the method constituting the present invention.

Accordingly, early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #056207.53989US).

Respectfully submitted,

July 5, 2007

/James F. MCKEOWN, Reg. No. 25406/
James F. McKeown
Registration No. 25,406

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
JFM:pcb